

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

PRIVATE

ENDC/PV.17
10 April 1962

ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 6 1963

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 10 April 1962, at 10 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. TARABANOV

(Bulgaria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. de MELLO-FRANCO
Mr. RODRIGUES RIBAS
Mr. ASSUNCAO de ARAUJO
Mr. de ALENCAR ARARIPE

Bulgaria:

Mr. M. TARABANOV
Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. N. MINTCHEV
Mr. G. GUELEV

Burma:

Mr. J. BARRINGTON
U Tin MAUNG

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. J.E.G. HARDY
Mr. J.F.M. BELL

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. HAJEK
Mr. M. ZEMLA
Mr. E. PEPIKH
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. GEBRE-EGZY
Mr. P. SAHLU
Mr. M. HAMID
Mr. A. MANDEPRO

India:

Mr. A.S. LALL
Mr. A.S. MEHTA
Mr. C.K. GAIROLA
Mr. M.B. NAIR

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. A. CAGIATI
Mr. C. COSTA-RIGHINI
Mr. F. LUCIOLI-OTTIERI

Mexico:

Mr. L. PADILLA NERVO
Mr. E. CALDERON PUIG
Miss E. AGUIRRE
Mr. A. de ICAZA

Nigeria:

Mr. A.A. ATTA
Mr. OBI

Poland:

Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI
Mr. M. LACHS
Mr. M. BIEN
Mr. W. WIECZOREK

Romania:

Mr. G. MACOVESCU
Mr. M. MALITZA
Mr. C. SANDRU
Mr. E. GLASER

Sweden:

Mr. E. EDBERG
Mr. H. BLIX
Mr. B. FRIEDMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. V.A. ZORIN
Mr. S.K. TSAMAPKIN
Mr. V.N. ZHEMEBTSOV
Mr. I.G. USACHEV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A.F. HASSAN
Mr. A. EL-ERIAN
Mr. M.S. AHMED
Mr. S. ABDEL-HAMID

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

United Kingdom:

Mr. J.B. GODBER
Sir Michael WRIGHT
Mr. J.S.H. SHATTOCK
Lord NORWICH

United States of America:

Mr. A. DEAN
Mr. C.C. STELLE
Mr. R. SPIERS
Mr. T. PICKERING

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. O. LOUTFI

Deputy to the Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I declare open the seventeenth meeting of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I am happy to inform the Conference that, in accordance with the arrangement agreed at the eleventh meeting of the plenary Conference on Thursday, 29 March, the United States delegation and the Soviet delegation have submitted for its consideration a joint working draft of a preamble to be included in a treaty to be agreed later. This has been circulated as document ENDC/L.7 of 6 April 1962. By this it is meant that the draft preamble is still a working draft ad referendum to governments and that later, when the substantive provisions of the treaty itself are in agreed draft form, the preamble will be subject to review and to integration into the treaty itself in such a manner as to ensure the consistency and integrity of the treaty as a whole.

In constructing this draft the co-Chairmen and their representatives studied most carefully each other's draft submissions and the excellent suggestions received from various other delegations, which were most helpful. The choice of language offered was wide, but the ideas that all sought to express were in general similar. Indeed, there are few paragraphs which reflect in their entirety the original language of the drafter, and in this sense it is a truly composite draft. But, as is the case with such drafts, style sometimes had to be sacrificed in order to get agreement in substance, so this joint working draft we are submitting still suffers somewhat from excess verbiage and still needs considerably more polish. While it may be thought that style is not important, we do want people to accept this text and I therefore think that some attention to style is worth while.

Furthermore, since complete agreement has not been reached, it is also an attempt to set down what has been agreed and what has not been agreed in this effort to work out a joint draft.

The United States Delegation would like the title of the paper to be: "Proposed United States-Soviet Union Draft Preamble to an Outline of Provisions of a Basic Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World."

As the Conference knows, the United States has already tabled Part I of its Outline of Provisions (ENDC/18), which includes a preamble of its own (ENDC/L.3) and which takes into account the earlier Soviet preamble (ENDC/2). As I shall

(Mr. Dean, United States)

demonstrate this morning, the present working draft represents considerable further effort by the United States delegation to move to meet the Soviet position, and indeed to meet the positions of other delegations on this subject.

The title of the paper which the Soviet delegation prefers is: "Proposed United States-Soviet Union Draft Preamble to the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament". The difference here again is between a preamble for an outline treaty and a preamble for a treaty. The Soviet delegation may maintain that there cannot be a preamble to an outline treaty but only to a treaty itself. Therefore, it may say, we have now started the process of drafting a treaty. For its part, the United States would agree that we have started the process of drafting a treaty, and, as I have said before, if we are to save time and expedite the drafting of a treaty, the first logical step in that process is to get agreement on the basic substance to be included in each stage before working out the exact detail line-by-line draft of the basic treaty.

We submit for the consideration of the Conference -- and I am sure others who have studied the so-called Soviet draft treaty would agree -- that the Soviet treaty itself is still an outline of a treaty. Even though our Soviet colleagues term it "a draft treaty" and use the format of obligations and articles. I would call attention to the fact that nowhere in it are to be found the essential details of definitions, specific levels, specific reductions, specific procedures, and so forth, that are necessary in a treaty of this importance to be submitted for ratification and implementation. Therefore, I hope we will not start any fruitless, semantic debate about whether this is a preamble for a treaty or for an outline treaty, since, in fact, as I have said and as can be seen if the Soviet document is carefully studied, it is also in effect an outline of a treaty.

At our twelfth meeting on 30 March, our Soviet colleague, Mr. Zorin, said we already have the outline. He went on:

"But how does it affect our work here?"

It means that on the fundamental principles, on the outline, as it were, of the treaty, we have already reached agreement." (ENDC/PV.12, page 49).

In other words, Mr. Zorin said, we have the outline in the form of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles of 20 September 1961. But everyone knows that the Agreed Principles of September last are merely, as the title says, "Principles" to which any programme of general and complete disarmament must conform. They are not the detailed and appropriately-phased outline of the substance to be included in stages I, II and III of a treaty.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

Mr. Zorin also said on 30 March:

"More than that, there is already a draft blueprint" (Ibid.);

and, referring to the Soviet draft treaty, he said:

"... There is a draft treaty" (Ibid.);

and he went on:

"There is the programme of general and complete disarmament proposed by the United States, which can also serve as some kind of draft blueprint" (Ibid.)

The interesting point I wish to make here is that our Soviet colleague, Mr. Zorin, himself agrees that the Soviet draft treaty is only a blueprint, and so, he says, is the United States plan of 25 September last on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. But inasmuch as Mr. Zorin also agrees that there is no agreed blueprint, we ask him whether the logical next step, if we are, as I hope, to speed the treaty drafting process, is not the working out of a joint agreed blueprint. Once that is done, we can go on to the drafting of the basic treaty, which is the term we use for the treaty.

A basic treaty -- and the word "basic", it seems to me, is important -- is the main core of a treaty, which is then capable of expansion by means of annexes which in turn have to be ratified if they are not covered by the basic treaty. In this sense, then, too, the so-called Soviet draft treaty might more appropriately be called an outline of a basic treaty,

Now I should like to turn to an explanation of the provisions of the working draft of the preamble. I shall take up each paragraph in turn and describe its genesis and the reason for the differences, if there are any.

In the draft joint preamble submitted to the Committee (ENDC/L.7), the United States preference is shown by the single parenthesis and the Soviet preference by the double parentheses. A number of the parentheses represent points of minor consequence and stem mainly from the use of different styles and constructions in the Russian and English languages and our preference for a somewhat shorter and more concise form.

Of the fifteen paragraphs eleven are agreed ad referendum in substance, but in some cases there remains an occasional language or stylistic difference. These agreed paragraphs are paragraphs 1 to 6, and 9 to 13, inclusive. The only differences of any true significance come in paragraphs 7 and 8 -- which we prefer as one paragraph to be taken together -- and in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

Because for the United States delegation paragraphs 7 and 8 are in effect one paragraph, and because the United States has an additional paragraph, number 14, to which the Soviet delegation does not agree, the number of paragraphs runs to sixteen, whereas the actual number of paragraphs is fifteen.

I shall now read paragraph by paragraph the language from the working draft which has been submitted to the Committee, commenting on each paragraph as I proceed through the document. As I said, when I read words in a single parenthesis they represent the United States preference and when I read words in double parentheses they represent the preference of our Soviet colleagues.

First let me take up the salutation.

"(We, the Nations) ((The States)) of the World:".

It will be noted that the salutation in form is common to both the United States and Soviet preambles and to the preamble submitted by Canada (ENDC/L.4). The difference is that the United States draft uses the word "Nations" because it is used in the United Nations Charter; because it represents both States and people; and because it is susceptible to both treaty outline and treaty language. The Canadian draft also uses "Nations". The Canadian draft reads: "The Nations of the World". Likewise, but on a different point, the Swedish delegation rightly points out (ENDC/L.1) that the Soviet Union should not use the words "The States of the World" when the possibility is envisaged -- as it is in article 46 of the Soviet draft -- that not all States are necessarily to become parties to the treaty.

Now let me turn to paragraph 1:

"Acting in accordance with the aspirations ((and will of the peoples)) (of all people)".

This paragraph is based on paragraph 1 of the Soviet draft preamble. The United States accepted the Soviet draft paragraph 1 of its draft treaty preamble with the omission of the words "and will of the peoples", and we inserted "of all people". In its memorandum (ENDC/L.6) Italy appeared to accept the Soviet paragraph as it is, and the United Kingdom apparently also accepted it. I base this merely on the fact that neither of them submitted amendments to it. If I misstate the position of any Government, I hope I shall be corrected. This paragraph 1, therefore, is agreed ad referendum by the United States and Soviet Delegations, with the exception I have specifically mentioned.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

Let me turn now to paragraph 2:

"Reaffirming ((their)) (our) dedication to the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter;".

This paragraph is identical with paragraph 8 of the Soviet draft preamble. The United States accepted the Soviet draft paragraph 8, as did the Canadian and United Kingdom Governments in their memoranda. The only difference is that, since the United States uses the words "We, the Nations" in the salutation, the word "our" is substituted for "their". This paragraph, too, is agreed ad referendum by the United States and Soviet delegations.

Let me turn now to paragraph 3:

"Desiring to create conditions in which all people can strive freely and peacefully to fulfil their just aspirations;".

This paragraph is identical with United States draft preamble paragraph 3. The Soviet Union accepted this United States paragraph 3, which is almost identical with the last part of Canada's draft preamble paragraph 3. This paragraph 3 is agreed ad referendum by the United States and Soviet delegations.

I now take up paragraph 4:

"Conscious of the threat to mankind posed by the arms race, especially in view of the development of nuclear, rocket and other modern weapons of mass destruction;".

This paragraph is based on the fourth paragraph, of the United States draft preamble (ENDC/L.3), which reads:

"Conscious of the crisis in human history produced by the revolutionary development of modern weapons in a divided world;". The United States sought to meet our Soviet colleague's objections to this United States paragraph 4 by removing the word "revolutionary" as a characterization of the development of modern weapons and by removing the words "crises in human history" and "in a divided world". The Soviet delegation thereupon accepted this paragraph, it being agreed by the two delegations that the reference in the Soviet paragraph 2 to "nuclear weapons and rockets" be included. Paragraph 4 is then agreed ad referendum by the United States and Soviet delegations.

Let me turn to paragraph 5:

"Convinced that war ((cannot and)) must not serve as a method for settling international disputes but must forever be banished from ((the life of)) human society;".

(Mr. Dean, United States)

This paragraph is based on the second paragraph of the Soviet draft preamble (ENDC/2). The United States accepted the second Soviet paragraph minus the middle clause, referring to weapons of mass annihilation, which, as indicated above, was inserted instead in paragraph 4. The Italian Government (ENDC/L.6) and the Government of India (ENDC/L.5), in their comments on the second Soviet paragraph, both agreed to the sense or substance of this language. In its memorandum (ENDC/L.2) the United Kingdom did not comment adversely on the second Soviet paragraph, so it is assumed to have had no objections. Let me say again what if I misinterpret any Government's memorandum, I should be glad to be corrected. Paragraph 5, therefore, is agreed ad referendum by the United States and Soviet delegations, except for the deletion of the words "cannot and" and "the life of", which the United States considers superfluous.

I now take up paragraph 6:

"Determined that this and succeeding generations should be free from the scourge of war and the dangers of the arms race;"

This paragraph is identical with the fifth paragraph of the United States draft preamble. Our Soviet colleagues accepted the fifth United States paragraph, which in turn had its counterpart in the third Soviet paragraph, in India's first paragraph, and in Canada's third paragraph. Paragraph 6 is agreed ad referendum by the United States and Soviet delegations.

Next we come to alternative Soviet and United States paragraphs. First I shall read separate paragraph 7 and separate paragraph 8, which is the Soviet version. Paragraph 7 reads:

"((Convinced that general and complete disarmament under strict international control is a sure and practical way to fulfil mankind's age-old dream of ensuring perpetual and inviolable peace on earth;)).

Paragraph 8 reads:

"((Having in mind that general and complete disarmament will be accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter))".

Next I shall read paragraphs 7 and 8 combined, which is the United States preferred version:

(Mr. Dean, United States)

"(Convinced that general and complete disarmament under strict international control and accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace is the sure and practical way to fulfil the deep desire of all men for perpetual peace on earth;)"

These paragraphs 7 and 8 are based on the fourth paragraph of the Soviet draft preamble and the last part of the last paragraph of the United States draft preamble. The United States accepted the fourth Soviet paragraph, but only if it were amended to include in the same paragraph the idea contained in the last part of the last United States paragraph: that is, that general and complete disarmament must be accompanied by the necessary peace-keeping arrangements. We consider it very important that, concomitant with general and complete disarmament, we develop reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace. This idea seems to be supported by both India in its third paragraph, and Canada in its seventh paragraph. However, the Soviet Union refused to include this idea in its paragraph and agreed to it only as a separate paragraph, which is single paragraph 8 in the joint draft. Our Soviet colleagues pointed to the separation of "(a)" and "(b)" in paragraph 1 of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles of 20 September 1961, which reads as follows:

"1. The goal of negotiations is to achieve agreement on a programme which will ensure that (a) disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems, and (b) such disarmament is accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter." (ENDC/5)

The United States delegation pointed out to our Soviet colleagues that "(a)" and "(b)" of paragraph 1 of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles were part of the same paragraph, and even the same sentence, in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles. As a compromise we offered to insert the letters "(a)" and "(b)", but our Soviet colleagues declined and stated that they preferred their version.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

The United States reasons are, very briefly, that general and complete disarmament by itself will not and cannot assure perpetual peace; it can do so only if it is accompanied by the progressive development of the necessary United Nations peace-keeping machinery as general and complete disarmament is achieved. General and complete disarmament is one of the important pillars of a world without war; but it is not, alone, the total foundation for such a world. We consider this to be a very important point.

The position of our Soviet colleagues appears to be that achievement of general and complete disarmament by itself will ensure that war and conflict will no longer be an instrument for settling international problems. We think this is contrary to the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles and therefore unacceptable to the United States. These paragraphs, therefore, are not agreed.

I turn now to paragraph 9:

"Desiring to end forever the heavy burden placed on mankind by the diversion of human and material resources to the creation of the means of annihilating human beings and of destroying material and cultural values;"

The alternative United States and Soviet versions -- United States draft preamble sixth paragraph, and Soviet draft preamble fifth paragraph -- were similar and had comparatively minor language differences. Both sides agreed to depart from their original wording. Canada in its third paragraph and the United Kingdom in its comment appear also to agree at least with the central idea. Paragraph 9 is agreed ad referendum by the United States and Soviet delegations.

I turn now to paragraph 10:

"Seeking to direct all resources towards ensuring further economic and social progress in all countries in the world and towards establishing conditions where the resources of nations shall be devoted to man's material, cultural, and spiritual advancement;"

The United States accepted the part of the sixth Soviet paragraph reading as follows: "seeking to direct all resources towards ensuring"; and our Soviet colleagues accepted the part of the United States seventh paragraph which reads: "advance of man's spiritual, cultural, and material well-being". The United Kingdom, Canada and Italy in their comments also indicate general agreement with the ideas expressed.

Paragraph 10 is agreed by the two delegations ad referendum.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

The result, however, has led to what we believe to be some repetitive and perhaps awkward language. The United States, therefore, recommends that the words "establishing conditions where the resources of nations shall be devoted to" be replaced by the single word "ensuring". If this were adopted, the paragraph would read:

"Seeking to direct all resources towards ensuring further economic and social progress in all countries in the world and towards ensuring man's material, cultural, and spiritual advancement."

Let me turn to paragraph 11, which reads as follows:

"Convinced that the resources released by general and complete disarmament will enhance the capacity of nations so disarmed to contribute to the economic and material well-being of all countries and peoples of the world and contribute to greater co-operation among them;".

This is India's eighth paragraph (ENDC/L.5) with minor word changes, and both the United States and the Soviet Union accepted it. India's eighth paragraph reads:

"Convinced that the resources released by world disarmament will enhance the capacity of nations so disarmed to contribute to the economic and material well-being of themselves and all countries and peoples of the world and contribute to greater co-operation and harmony;".

Paragraph 11 is agreed ad referendum by the two delegations.

Let me take up paragraph 12, as follows:

"Conscious of the need to build relations among ((States and peoples)) (nations) on the basis of the principles of peace, good neighbourliness, equality, non-interference, and respect for the independence and sovereignty of all ((countries)) (nations);".

This is the seventh paragraph of the Soviet draft preamble. The United States, accepted it and so did Canada in its fourth paragraph. This paragraph is agreed ad referendum except for the United States preference for the word "nations" instead of "States" or "countries" as preferred by the Soviet Union.

Let me now turn to paragraph 13, which reads as follows:

"Desiring to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and international law can be maintained;".

(Mr. Dean, United States)

This is Canada's fourth paragraph, which both the United States and the Soviet Union accepted. Paragraph 13 is agreed ad referendum by the two delegations.

I now turn to paragraph 14:

"(Declaring our goal to be a free, secure and peaceful world of independent States adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world where adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter; and a world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control);"

Paragraph 14 is the United States eighth paragraph, which states what the goal is. The Soviet delegation objected particularly to the middle clause, "a world where adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter;". They rejected the middle clause, which describes the goal as "a world where adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the United Nations Charter", because it implied, our Soviet colleagues said, that even "internal and domestic" change would have to take place in accordance with the United Nations Charter, and this, they said, they could not accept. My delegation, on the other hand, feels that the kind of charter for mankind that we are attempting to write in this Conference should contain a recognition that, in the course of man's constant effort to improve his life, change is inevitable. Change is certain and change must be planned for. The direction of change cannot always be foretold, but it is indeed important that provision be made to ensure that adjustment to change be peaceful. I can think of no better or more widely accepted criterion than that this change be "in accordance with the United Nations Charter".

I confess I am somewhat puzzled at the rejection by our Soviet colleagues of this paragraph and of its reference to the United Nations Charter. I consider that this is a matter of substance, and I would hope that the Soviet Union would find it possible after more study to accept this paragraph as an appropriate preambular paragraph to the epoch-making agreement we are striving to reach.

I am sorry to say that paragraph 14 is not agreed.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

I now turn to paragraph 15:

"Affirming that to facilitate the attainment of general and complete disarmament (in a peaceful world) it is important that all (nations) ((States)) abide by existing international agreements, refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and that they seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means;".

Paragraph 15 is the fourth paragraph of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles of 20 September 1961, which reads:

"Affirming that to facilitate the attainment of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world it is important that all States abide by existing international agreements, refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and that they seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means;". (ENDC/5)

The representatives of the Soviet Union at first accepted this as it is in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles. Then Mr. Zorin on 29 March, after reading it as it is in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles, said:

"This is the passage which Mr. Rusk mentioned and which we consider it completely appropriate to include in the preamble of the treaty."

(ENDC/PV.11, page 5)

But then at the last bilateral meeting, between our two delegations, on Friday last, Mr. Zorin asked for the deletion of what we regard as key words: "in a peaceful world". As I have said, these words "in a peaceful world" are the exact formulation agreed last September by the Soviet Union in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles. But Mr. Zorin has now asked that the words "in a peaceful world" be deleted from the heading of the document and from paragraph 16, the only other places where they appear. With this principal difference which the United States still regards as fundamental, paragraph 15 is otherwise agreed ad referendum by the two delegations.

We wonder if the Soviet attitude on this paragraph bears a relationship to the problem in paragraphs 7 and 8. Here again is language clearly agreed upon in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles, and yet language which the Soviet Union, for reasons that are not clear to us, seems now to find unacceptable. Again, we hope that the Soviet Union will reconsider and accept our proposals on both these points.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

I now turn to paragraph 16:

"Have resolved to conclude (a) ((the present)) treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control (in a peaceful world.)".

This paragraph is based on the ninth Soviet paragraph and the tenth United States paragraph of their draft preambles. The paragraph is not agreed because, again, our Soviet colleagues want to delete the words "in a peaceful world", and they also prefer the words "the present treaty" to the words "a treaty". The United States does not accept the words "the present treaty" because, as indicated earlier, it considers the preamble to be a preamble not to an existing treaty but to a treaty that will be worked out and agreed later, after there is an agreed blueprint.

The language of the concluding paragraph of the Canadian preamble is similar to the United States wording in this respect. The Canadian text reads:

"Resolve to conclude and implement forthwith a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control, accompanied by the necessary international arrangements to maintain world peace and security." (ENDC/L.4)

I am afraid that this presentation to the Conference has been rather boring, but I thought that making it in this way and giving the genesis of each of the paragraphs might help us in arriving at our conclusions.

Let me say to the Conference that I believe both delegations have shown a most constructive willingness to understand each other and to reach agreement. The result has been almost complete agreement on eleven of the fifteen paragraphs. The differences which remain are in some cases, as I say, perhaps differences in construction and style between the English and Russian languages. Others might be overcome if our Soviet colleagues were to return to what we thought they had already agreed to in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles.

It is the suggestion of my delegation that it might be helpful if at this point a drafting sub-committee on the preamble were to be established, consisting of the two co-Chairmen and perhaps two other representatives. If this were to be agreed to, the drafting sub-committee should meet promptly and report to the plenary Conference by Friday of this week.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): The Committee has before it the draft preamble to the treaty on general and complete disarmament which has been prepared by our co-Chairmen from the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

In preparing this draft preamble, account was taken of the proposals, additions and observations relating to the draft preamble that have been put forward by individual delegations - those of India, Italy, Canada, the United Kingdom and Sweden.

We welcome the fact that the Committee is in a position to study the text of a draft preamble on which agreement has largely been reached. The submission of such an agreed draft preamble for the Committee's consideration is a definite advance towards the accomplishment of the task assigned to the Committee - the elaboration of an agreement on general and complete disarmament. We might point out in this connexion that the present meeting is an event of some importance in that we are, so to speak, laying the foundation stone of the building which we have to erect.

We have before us a text, which has been agreed upon by the co-Chairmen, of the introductory part of a document which should mark the beginning of a new phase of international relations, a phase in which war as a means of settling international disputes must be banished from relations among States. It is inevitably a source of satisfaction that the basic principle followed in preparing the draft preamble was the need for the practical achievement of general and complete disarmament. Moreover, the agreed draft preamble contains fundamental ideas expressed in the draft preamble to the treaty on general and complete disarmament which was submitted by the Soviet Union for the Committee's consideration and which has, on the whole, received the support of the delegations represented in the Committee.

The proposals of delegations included provisions which, in view of their content, must be considered not in connexion with the preamble to the draft treaty but with articles of the treaty, because these provisions are related to the assumption of specific obligations by States and should be incorporated in articles of the treaty. Examination of proposals on these questions has been deferred until the relevant articles of the treaty on general and complete disarmament are taken up.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

We would also point out that a number of provisions proposed by delegations have been included in the draft preamble submitted for consideration by the Committee. Thus, the extremely important provision proposed by the delegation of India, namely,

"... that the resources released by World Disarmament will enhance the capacity of nations so disarmed to contribute to the economic and material well-being of themselves and all countries and peoples of the world and contribute to greater co-operation and harmony"; (ENDC/5) has been included in the draft preamble.

This provision is set out in paragraph 11 of the draft preamble before the Committee. In passing, I would like to say that a number of important provisions of the draft preamble proposed by India have not been included in the draft preamble before the Committee solely because their content is clearly related to the subsequent articles 1, 2 and 3 of the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament.

A provision has been included in the draft preamble concerning respect for the obligations arising from treaties and international law; it has been taken from the draft preamble of Canada. This idea, which is also to be found in the proposal of the Italian delegation, is contained in paragraph 13 of the draft preamble.

One of the amendments to the preamble of the Soviet draft treaty, submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, provides that all resources shall be devoted not only to man's material but also to his cultural and spiritual advance. This view, which was also supported by the Italian delegation, is reflected in paragraph 10 of the draft preamble.

A number of less important additions and ideas put forward by different delegations have also been incorporated in various paragraphs of the draft preamble now submitted by the co-Chairmen.

However, as can be seen from this draft preamble to the treaty on general and complete disarmament, there are a number of provisions on which agreement has still not been reached between the co-Chairmen. The important provisions which have not been agreed include the following:

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

First, the text of paragraph 7 of the preamble proposed by the Soviet Union (ENDC/L.7) expresses the conviction that "general and complete disarmament under strict international control is a sure and practical way to fulfil mankind's age-old dream of ensuring perpetual and inviolable peace on earth". This text proposed by the Soviet Union is a generally-accepted formula which has been repeatedly expressed in one form or another by many of the world's statesmen. It emphasizes the important idea that it is through general and complete disarmament and not through the use of force or any other means that perpetual and inviolable peace can be ensured.

That is why resolution 1378 (XIV) of the United Nations General Assembly of 20 November 1959 states that "the question of general and complete disarmament is the most important one facing the world today". That is why this same resolution calls upon governments "to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem"

General Assembly resolution 1722 (XVI) of 20 December 1961 fully reaffirmed resolution 1378 (XIV) and expressed deep concern that "the objectives of that resolution be achieved as early as possible". Thus general and complete disarmament under strict international control was not subordinated to any conditions and was advocated as a sure and practical way of ensuring a stable peace.

This is why the Soviet delegation has expressed its opposition to the insertion of any additional provisions in paragraph 7, which defines the significance and role of general and complete disarmament. Such provisions might be regarded as diminishing the important role and significance of general and complete disarmament in ensuring a stable peace. It is for this reason that we objected to the wording of the paragraph proposed by the United States delegation (paragraph 7 & 8) in the section of the preamble on which agreement was not reached. In this paragraph the role and significance of general and complete disarmament are qualified by the inclusion of the phrase "accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace", which, however, omits any reference to the fact that these procedures should be in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, as specified in the Agreed Principles.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The inclusion of such a provision would detract from the great significance and role of general and complete disarmament by imposing what might be described as a preliminary condition, which must be fulfilled if that significance and role are to have any value. In our view, this interpretation of the role and significance of general and complete disarmament is a distortion of the facts and casts doubt on the implementation of general and complete disarmament as the most reliable and effective way to ensure perpetual and inviolable peace on earth. It seems to us that this has been brought out again today by Mr. Dean's comments on this paragraph.

The Soviet Union delegation considered it necessary to state in a separate paragraph (paragraph 8) that general and complete disarmament "will be accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter (ENDC/L.7). However, although the Soviet delegation has included this provision in a separate paragraph, it regards the measures in question purely as supplementary measures to be carried out during the implementation of general and complete disarmament and is not proposing this provision as a condition upon which the value and role of general and complete disarmament depend.

Furthermore, Mr. Rusk, the United States Secretary of State, speaking in the Committee on 27 March, proposed that the provision of the Agreed Principles I have just mentioned should be added to the provisions of the Soviet draft preamble and this proposal was accepted by the Soviet delegation. For reasons which we cannot understand, the United States delegation has now insisted and is continuing to insist that this provision should be included as an integral part of the text of paragraph 7. For the reasons I have just given, we were unable to agree to this inclusion and retained this paragraph as a separate paragraph 8.

Secondly, we did not agree with paragraph 14 of the draft preamble, which has been proposed by the United States, partly because it repeats ideas contained in other paragraphs, and partly because, in our view, it includes provisions which are clearly incorrect.

For instance, the proposition that the goal of general and complete disarmament is "a free, secure and peaceful world" is in fact contained in paragraphs 3 and 6 of the draft preamble.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The stipulation that States should adhere to "common standards of justice and international conduct" and subject "the use of force to the rule of law" duplicates the provisions of paragraph 13, which refers to the need to maintain justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and international law, and of paragraph 15, which states that "all ... States abide by existing international agreements". There is therefore no need to include these provisions again in the new paragraph of the preamble proposed by the United States.

We consider that the statement in the paragraph 14 proposed by the United States, that our goal is "a world where adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter", is incorrect. As we know, far-reaching changes are taking place throughout the world as a result on the one hand, of the liberation of former colonial peoples from colonial dependency and the creation of new independent States and, on the other, of major social and economic changes caused by the natural historical process of the revolutionary transformation of society in accordance with the interests and wishes of the popular masses struggling for national and social emancipation.

These changes vary from country to country, depending on historical, national and economic conditions, and it would be quite unrealistic to believe that this many-sided historical process can be contained within any pre-determined framework. To do so would be to attempt to impose on each country or nation, from outside and by means of interference in its domestic affairs, a framework, laws and principles which may be unsuitable to that country or nation, which is the master of its own fate. The political purpose of such external regulation of the whole varied process of the historical development of individual nations and countries can only be to delay the progressive development of society and to impede the national liberation movement and the far-reaching social and economic changes which are in progress and which must inevitably come about in the different countries of the world.

We cannot follow such a course and therefore cannot agree with the text proposed by the United States delegation, which can serve only to hinder a natural historical process now taking place throughout the world. The proposal to include such a text is all the more unjustifiable in that it relates to the preamble of a treaty which has a quite specific purpose, that of bringing about general and complete disarmament, and which neither has nor can have any bearing

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

on the general principles of the organization of society which this text purports to define. That is why the Soviet delegation, basing itself on the considerations of principle mentioned above, did not agree to the inclusion in the draft preamble of the paragraph proposed by the United States delegation.

There are also differences of opinion on the drafting of the last paragraph of the preamble -- paragraph 16 -- and on the heading. The Soviet delegation regards the preamble we are drafting as an introduction to a specific treaty on general and complete disarmament, of which we are required to prepare a draft in accordance with the direct instructions given by the General Assembly at its sixteenth session. The United States delegation, however, seems to have in mind a preamble to some unspecified treaty on general and complete disarmament and it does not relate the draft preamble to the instrument which we have already started to draw up. The Soviet delegation cannot concur with that approach, since it introduces an element of vagueness into the whole of our work of drafting a treaty. Indeed it is impossible to produce a single piece of evidence to show that the preamble is not directly related to the instrument of which it constitutes an integral and inseparable part.

The explanation on this subject given today by Mr. Dean, the representative of the United States, is not satisfactory to us. We consider it absolutely essential to draw up a specific draft treaty. This does not mean that the first version of this treaty will represent the final draft. No, we are fully aware that it will merely be a blueprint, a working draft, which we think it essential to prepare so that we may have an opportunity to submit amendments, additions, etc. during our final revision of the text. But this also means that we consider it essential to prepare a preamble and the other component parts of a specific draft treaty.

These are the most important differences of opinion between ourselves and the United States delegation on the drafting of the preamble to the treaty on general and complete disarmament. There are a few other differences of opinion on specific drafting points. I will indicate the most important of these, although we believe that these points might be further studied during our subsequent work on the treaty. In particular, the United States delegation has urged that the phrase "in a peaceful world" should be added whenever reference is made to general and complete disarmament. This phrase is used in the Joint

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Statement of Agreed Principles and, as you know, the Soviet Union did not object to that provision as a general principle. But now that we are beginning to prepare the draft treaty itself, we think it may be open to misinterpretation.

We consider it unwarranted to include in the preamble to a treaty on general and complete disarmament a qualifying phrase which would give the impression that general and complete disarmament can be brought about only in a peaceful world, in other words, only when all controversial and outstanding issues have been settled. We believe that such a limitation would impede the solution of the specific task before us, that of achieving general and complete disarmament. That is why we put this phrase in brackets.

There was also a difference of opinion between us on paragraph 5 of the draft preamble. The United States objected to including in the draft preamble a statement that war cannot serve as a method of settling international disputes. It was in favour merely of stating that it "must not serve as a method"; in other words, the United States apparently considered and considers that war can serve as a method of settling international disputes. We consider that such a view is incorrect. At the present time, in view of modern means of waging war such as nuclear weapons and missiles, war not only must not, but cannot serve as a method of settling international disputes. That is why we have insisted on retaining in paragraph 5 the words "cannot and", which express our profound conviction that in modern conditions war cannot in any way settle international disputes. Our opinion on this point differs from that of the United States and this is perhaps a more profound difference than might appear at first sight.

We believe, however, that, although our opinions differ on these quite important provisions of the preamble, these differences can and must be eliminated in the course of our further work. We do not consider that we should break off the work we have begun on the discussion and preparation of subsequent parts of the treaty and should attempt at this stage to secure the immediate elimination of the disagreements which have arisen on the wording of the preamble. If, after today's discussion in the Committee of the draft preamble before us, it becomes obvious that we cannot succeed at present in smoothing out the existing differences, we should adopt a draft preamble containing two variants of certain paragraphs and provisions. I hope that the Committee will succeed in overcoming these differences of opinion in the course of its further work on the draft treaty; then we will be able to move on through the whole draft treaty, taking into account the

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

proposals that have been submitted. I think that this would be an entirely correct procedure and it is, moreover, the one we have in fact followed throughout the work of the Conference.

These are the views which we felt obliged to put forward in order to make our position clear on certain important provisions of this draft preamble. On the whole, we are satisfied with the work that has been done on the preamble to the draft treaty and consider that it constitutes a definite step towards our primary objective, that of preparing a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

Mr. BURNS (Canada): The Canadian delegation would like to congratulate our co-Chairmen on the work they have done and the degree of agreement they have reached in producing for us this working draft of a preamble to a treaty on general and complete disarmament. We are also grateful to the co-Chairmen for the consideration they have given to the suggestions put forward by other delegations regarding this preamble. We are particularly grateful for the consideration given to the suggestion which we ourselves put forward. Adopting the simile which the Soviet representative used -- that this preamble could constitute the laying of a cornerstone for a step forward towards general and complete disarmament -- I would say that Canada is very happy that it may have been able to contribute its little trowelful of mortar.

I do not wish to speak at length on the details of the disputed points in this preamble, but I think it might be helpful to the co-Chairmen, in their further consideration and attempts to reach an agreed text, if delegations here were to put forward their views on these points which are still at issue. I will now proceed to do so on behalf of the Canadian delegation.

We prefer the wording "We, the nations" to "We, the States", and generally in the text would prefer to see the word "nations" rather than "States" used. This preference is largely dictated by the use of the word "nations" in the Charter and other important documents of the United Nations. And after all, we are meeting here under the aegis of the United Nations and not of the United States.

We are not particularly concerned with one or other of the alternative drafts of paragraph 1. Indeed, we are a little doubtful whether this paragraph is really necessary in view of the terms of paragraph 3.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

The next point we have concerns paragraph 5. We think that the words in double parenthesis might be deleted without changing the sense. We noted the argument of the Soviet representative that "cannot" should be included, but we are not convinced that the English phrase "must not" does not include the idea that it is impossible to settle international disputes by war.

The next point we wish to refer to is the question whether paragraphs 7 and 8, in accordance with the Soviet preference, or the combined paragraphs, in accordance with the United States preference, should be adopted. To some extent this raises the question of the words "in a peaceful world". The Soviet representative seemed to feel that it was unnecessary to include the term "in a peaceful world" in the various places where they had been suggested by the United States delegation.

It would seem to us that this is a question of a philosophical approach. The view of the Canadian delegation -- and I think also of the United States delegation -- is that to achieve a peaceful world we have to have general and complete disarmament and we also have to have effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the United Nations Charter. For even if we disarm to the degree which is proposed in both plans, that is, practically down to handguns for the remaining forces for the preservation of internal order, it will still be possible for people to fight: it was possible for people to fight when they had only clubs and bows and arrows. Therefore, if we are to have a peaceful world or if "mankind's age-old dream of ensuring perpetual and inviolable peace on earth" is to be achieved, something besides disarming is needed: what is needed is means for preserving peace.

Therefore, we think the two things have to go together and our preference would be for the wording of the combined paragraphs 7 and 8, since we feel that all the ideas necessary are included therein and it is worded more compactly and, one might say, more elegantly. We hope that it will be possible in further discussions for the two co-Chairmen to arrive at agreement on this point.

With regard to paragraph 14, we are in agreement with the ideas and sentiments expressed in this paragraph, but we have some doubt whether it is really necessary to include such a provision in a preamble. We feel that the ideas generally have been expressed in other paragraphs. It might, however, be worth while to refer to change taking place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. The Soviet representative appeared to feel that this might refer to

(Mr. Burns, Canada,

internal change within nations. It would seem to us that if the principle of the United Nations Charter embodied in Article 2(7) -- that is, non-interference in the domestic affairs of States -- were observed, this would obviate the objection he might have to this particular phrase. It would seem also that if we agreed on the principles set forth in paragraph 12 of the preamble -- the principles of good neighbourliness, equality, non-interference and respect for the independence and sovereignty of all countries or nations -- then any objection to "change taking place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter" could also be eliminated. However, as I said at the beginning, the Canadian delegation, while it agrees with the ideas in paragraph 14, is not entirely convinced of the necessity of including them.

That concludes the observations I have in regard to the drafting of this preamble. The Canadian delegation would hope that it would be possible, after the observations of all who wish to make them have been heard, for the co-Chairmen to resume their task and see whether they cannot come to a closer agreement. We would also feel that the suggestion of the representative of the Soviet Union -- that if it is not possible to achieve complete agreement, then certain sections of this preamble might be left in the alternative, bracketed form -- might be accepted and we could then turn our attention to some of the further questions which we have to solve in developing an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

Mr. MACOVESCU (Romania): I would like at this stage of our debates, and especially after listening to the explanations given to us by our co-Chairmen, to make certain comments in connexion with the proposals submitted to us with a view to working out the preamble to the treaty on general and complete disarmament. The Romanian delegation has already had the opportunity to express its opinion as to the importance of the preamble for a proper understanding and application of the treaty on general and complete disarmament. Today our Conference finds itself in a new stage of discussions, with the co-Chairmen submitting a joint draft on the preamble to the treaty on general and complete disarmament. This is the first joint working document with regard to the very text of the treaty we have the task of working out. We note with satisfaction that out of the sixteen paragraphs which make up the joint draft seven are identical -- in other words, they represent full agreement. As concerns four other paragraphs, we can say

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

that after we have reached agreement on a matter of terminology -- "nations" or "States" -- we will likewise have texts which represent the full agreement of all the parties concerned. In fact there are only two paragraphs for which separate texts have been submitted to us. Favourable conditions have thus been created for the text of the preamble to be worked out soon.

I should like to emphasize the particular importance that the successful working out of the text of the preamble of the treaty on general and complete disarmament, and this as soon as possible, has for the proceedings of our discussions. We are dealing here with the preamble, that is with the motives which determine us to elaborate a treaty on general and complete disarmament, as well as with the aims which the implementation of this treaty is meant to serve. It seems there are no fundamental divergencies here.

What is more, as concerns those general proposals and the ideas which should guide the interpretation and implementation of the treaty on general and complete disarmament -- and it is these very ideas that the preamble should sum up -- there exists a general agreement embodied in the joint Soviet-United States statement of 20 September 1961, which was endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in its well-known resolution of 20 December 1961. Furthermore, after the representative of the Soviet Union had submitted the Soviet draft preamble to a treaty on general and complete disarmament, general approval of the principles presented in that text was noted.

We could record declarations of adhesion which, unfortunately, previous debates on disarmament have entirely lacked. Thus Lord Home said, referring to the statement made by Mr. Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister, concerning the preamble:

"I find myself, if I may say so, in almost total agreement with everything said by Mr. Gromyko. When I wrote that sentence down, I had to look at it several times to make sure that it was right. It was, I am glad to say, and that gives me considerable encouragement.

"I should like to give more thought to what Mr. Gromyko said concerning the preamble to the Soviet treaty. At any rate I should like at some future time to make certain proposals or additions -- indeed there may be others who would like to do the same -- and I do not know what kind of preamble would emerge. But I have very little, if any, quarrel with the sentiments which he expressed."

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

And Mr. Rusk, the United States Secretary of State, said:

"Our delegation does not have any serious objection" --

I stress the word "serious" --

"to the ideas expressed in the preamble submitted by the Soviet Union, but I do think that there are certain omissions in it that we would need to consider." (Ibid., page 37)

As an example Mr. Rusk quoted the principle laid down in the joint Soviet-United States statement to the effect that:

"... it is important that all States ... refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and that they seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means" (ENDC/5, page 1)

He also cited the principle of the joint statement concerning -

"... the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and ... for the maintenance of peace ..." (Ibid.)

As is well known, the Soviet delegation has already accepted these additions proposed to its draft preamble.

The Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Rusk, said that, after all delegations had been given a chance to make such comments on the Soviet draft as they might wish to make, "we could move toward a joint draft". Many days have passed since then. All delegations which deemed it necessary to make concrete proposals concerning the contents and drafting of the preamble have had ample opportunity to do so, and many of them have already taken this opportunity. We consider that it should not be difficult for us to come to an agreement on the text as a whole. We shall take into consideration in this connexion the stands of the Soviet and North American delegations and also the comments and stands of the other delegations.

With regard to divergencies between the Soviet and United States delegations as reflected in the joint working draft submitted to us on 6 April, I shall not comment on all of them but shall limit myself to three points.

The first refers to the very title of the preamble. The version submitted by the United States delegation speaks about an "Outline of Provisions of a Basic Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament". The Soviet version speaks about a "Preamble to the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament".

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

We stand for the Soviet version. We are not in fact working out the exterior outlines of some basic principles of a non-specific treaty. This is a phase which has long since been left behind, and which in fact ended with the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly on 20 December 1961 of the joint Soviet-United States Statement of Agreed Principles of 20 September 1961. What has to be elaborated now is the treaty -- the treaty on general and complete disarmament. Let us recall in this respect the Joint Statement of 20 September itself, which deliberately refers to a treaty, as well as our procedural decisions of 23 March 1962 (ENDC/1/Add.1), which clearly indicate this as the purpose of our proceedings.

Moreover, the United States Government, in its programme for disarmament of 27 June 1960 submitted to the Ten Nation Committee in Geneva, points out:

"The task of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament is to work out a treaty for general and complete disarmament under effective international control ...". (TNCD/7, page 3)

So at that time the United States Government admitted that what we had to elaborate was a treaty on general and complete disarmament. If it is now opposing this, if it is now asserting that only the outlines of a non-specific treaty should be worked out, this means that the United States Government is taking a step backwards.

I should like to make a second comment, this time in connexion with paragraph 5 of the joint Soviet-United States draft of 6 April 1962. As stressed by this text, the United States side did not accept the proposal of the Soviet delegation that the conviction be expressed that war cannot serve as a method of solving international disputes. I must admit that I do not understand why the United States delegation opposes the insertion of these words. The United States President, Mr. Kennedy, himself admitted in his address to the United Nations General Assembly on 25 September 1961 that war "can no longer serve to settle disputes" (A/PV.1013).

I should now like to dwell at some length on a third point, in fact the last I want to raise in connexion with the draft preamble jointly worked out by the Soviet and United States delegations.

Among all the differences between the stand of the Soviet delegation and that of the United States, I consider as the most important, because it bears on the very content of the conception concerning the process of general and complete

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

disarmament and a world without weapons, the one referring to the necessity for disarmament being accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and efficient arrangements for the maintenance of order in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The Soviet draft preamble and that part of the joint draft reflecting the stand of the Soviet delegation -- and I mean here paragraph 8 of the joint draft -- particularly refers to the principles of the United Nations Charter. On the other hand, in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the joint draft which reproduces the point of view of the United States delegation there is no reference whatever to the United Nations Charter.

If we want to maintain peace, it is necessary that we should strengthen the United Nations, an international organization set up with the very aim of maintaining peace and international security. The United Nations can be strengthened only through observing the principles of its basic document, the Charter, and not through eluding or ignoring them. All procedures and institutions we could think of for the ensuring of peace throughout the world, both during the process of general and complete disarmament and after the completion of this process, must be based on the principles of the United Nations Charter and must contribute to the strengthening of this organization. Whatever undermines the United Nations -- which today has a membership of 104 and which was set up in 1945 to watch over the maintenance of peace throughout the world -- cannot serve the cause of peace.

Please allow me to recall in this connexion -- that is, in connexion with the necessity of including measures essential to the settlement of international conflicts and for the maintenance of peace among States in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter -- the very programme of the United States for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, submitted on 25 September 1961, which provides in its fourth preambular paragraph, sub-paragraph (d):

"The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations."

(ENDC/6, page 1)

We now ask ourselves this: if on 25 September 1961 the United States Government admitted that the procedures and institutions to be elaborated and set up for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts and for the maintenance

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

of peace must be in accordance with the United Nations Charter, why is the United States delegation now opposing the insertion in the preamble of this reference to the principles of the Charter?

The socialist countries are not the only ones who are insisting on the United Nations Charter being observed as regards the organization of general and complete disarmament. I might recall the draft resolution submitted to the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly by a group of States including Burma, India and the United Arab Republic, which are also members of our Committee (A/C.1/L.259). The draft resolution to which I am referring speaks particularly paragraph 1 (d), point V) about the use of security units with a view to maintaining peace and international security in accordance with the United Nations Charter, and of the necessity that international police forces be used only for purposes compatible with the Charter.

The Indian delegation, consistent with this stand, provides in two paragraphs of its draft preamble for a treaty on general and complete disarmament, for the necessity of basing all procedures and institutions of general and complete disarmament on the principles of the United Nations Charter. I quote the third paragraph of the Indian draft:

"Conscious that for the aforesaid purpose it is essential that general and complete disarmament and the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes as well as effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter should be pursued simultaneously;"

I also quote the fifth paragraph of the Indian draft:

"Having determined that States will have at their disposal only those forces, facilities and establishments which are agreed to be necessary for maintaining internal order and security for their citizens and for furnishing agreed manpower and assistance as may be required by the United Nations;" (ENDC/L.5)

We consider that if an agreement is reached recognizing the necessity of full observance of the principles of the United Nations Charter and of mentioning this necessity in the preamble, it should not be difficult to come to an agreement with respect to the paragraph 7 submitted by the Soviet delegation. This paragraph provides for general and complete disarmament under strict international control

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

as a sure and practical way to fulfil mankind's age-old dream of ensuring perpetual and inviolable peace on earth. This principle has to be stressed in a separate paragraph. The wording proposed by the Soviet delegation clearly takes account of the comments made by the representative of Canada, Mr. Burns, on 29 March 1962:

"As previous speakers have pointed out, the preamble to a treaty on general and complete disarmament will have great significance. Its content should be most carefully considered and its language should be precise and dignified, one might almost say solemn, for in this preamble will be set forth the motives, the intentions and the hopes of all parties to the disarmament agreement, which we all intend to be a landmark in human history." (ENDC/PV.11, page 15)

In fact, the wording of the Soviet draft is correct: ever since there have been wars, mankind has dreamt of a world without war; the Latin poet said "Bella matribus detesta".

In conclusion, I should like to express the satisfaction of my delegation that agreement has already been reached with respect to a large number of paragraphs of the preamble. In the hope that today's debate will bring about a clarification of those parts of the preamble upon which no agreement has been reached so far, the Romanian delegation proposes that the co-Chairmen be asked to resume their work jointly, taking due account of today's proceedings, and to present to our Committee by the end of the week a draft preamble which may express -- and I am sure this is the hope of other delegations as well -- an agreement on all the provisions of the preamble to the treaty on general and complete disarmament. This proposal is made in the conviction that the existing differences may be overcome quickly, without any prejudice to the work on the other articles.

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): First I wish to note, as the representatives who preceded me have noted, that the co-Chairmen have shown a spirit of co-operation, and, if I may say so, the statements they made this morning were both considerate and accommodating.

We note with satisfaction that most of the provisions of the preamble have been produced by agreement. It is true that there are differences both of substance and in terms of language; this has been explained by the co-Chairmen.

(Mr. Gobre-Egzy, Ethiopia)

The first substantive difference is reflected in the title of this document. One party wishes to call it a draft preamble to outline provisions of a basic treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, and the other party wishes to call it a draft preamble to the treaty on general and complete disarmament. This is, of course, a very substantive difference. I do not believe that it can be resolved by discussing it here. Perhaps the best procedure would be to leave it for later consideration in the hope that the co-Chairmen themselves may find a solution.

The next point relates to the question whether we should say "We, the Nations" or "We, the States". Despite what the representative of Canada has said, I think the more accepted practice is to say "The States parties to" the document or treaty that will be agreed. It is true that the Charter uses a different terminology, but I am sure that if experts in international law were asked their opinion they would agree that it is normal to say "The States parties to" the particular document. I doubt whether the concept of "nations" is clearly understood in international law. After all, it is only States, and not nations, that are subject to international law. If we should agree on this point, then I think we may ask the co-Chairmen to consider making the necessary consequential changes in other provisions. For example, we would have to say, "Reaffirming their dedication", that is to say, the dedication of the States that are to sign the document.

My next observation concerns paragraphs 7 and 8 in the separate form as opposed to paragraphs 7 and 8 in the combined form. I believe the former draft is preferred by the Soviet Union, and the latter by the United States. First, I note that both drafts agree that a procedure for the peaceful settlement of disputes as set out in the Charter should be developed. The Soviet draft specifically mentions the United Nations Charter, and the United States draft does not. However, I believe that both drafts basically wish to improve the existing procedure for settling international disputes.

The next point is that they seem to differ on when this should be done. Of course it is difficult for us to say what sort of improvements should be made before we see what the propositions from both sides are. With respect to the second point, however, that is to say, when this should be done, it may be possible to make arrangements for it to be done simultaneously. Instead of one saying that it should be "before" and the other "afterwards", possibly the solution would

(Mr. Gebre-Egzy, Ethiopia)

be to develop it simultaneously with the treaty. That may be a way out. Of course we do not wish to comment now on what should be done. We would rather do that when we see the propositions of both sides. We will then be able to say what our inclination would be. That being the case, it may very well be better to leave these points as they are for later consideration. If the co-Chairmen can solve them, well and good; if they cannot, we could come back to them later, as the representative of Canada has suggested.

The next point which we think deserving of attention is paragraph 14 -- I think this was proposed by the United States. My trouble with this provision is that the wording creates difficulties. It may be very nice to have a common standard of justice, but I think we are deluding ourselves if we believe there is one common standard of justice. It is a fact that States and peoples all over the world have different concepts and standards of justice. That being the case it may very well be to our advantage to use language which is not susceptible of different interpretations. For example -- this is merely a preliminary observation -- perhaps it may be possible to say:

"Declaring our goal to be a free, secure and peaceful world of independent States adhering to a common standard of international relations in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, and a world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control ..."

That is not a formal proposal; I am just thinking aloud in order to see whether we can work out a terminology which does not commit all of us to a common standard. I am not saying that it would not be a good thing to have one common standard -- it would be perfectly good -- but I do not know whether it exists at the present time and I do not know whether it will ever exist. If it could be achieved little by little in the future we should be very happy, but at the moment it does not exist and that being so, it would be better to refer to an existing norm of relations, which is the Charter of the United Nations.

These are the few thoughts that we wished to express at this stage. I am bound to say that my remarks are of a preliminary nature, and that we would reserve our right to submit, if necessary, our point of view in more detailed form at the appropriate time, that is to say, when this comes up for a second reading. But for the moment we wish to join the representative of Canada in saying that the

(Mr. Gebre-Egzy, Ethiopia)

co-Chairmen should meet again and make a further attempt to reduce the areas of differences, and that those that cannot be eliminated should be kept in the document for later consideration.

Mr. LALL (India): We have just listened to a very conciliatory and helpful statement by our colleague from Ethiopia. I am very much in agreement with almost all that he has said. We also take note that the entire consideration of this matter today is proceeding in a manner which befits us as members of this Conference. I have deliberately used the word "consideration" rather than "debate" because we, for one, feel that this is not a debating hall but a room in which we are trying to reach agreements, and therefore we conceive of our work here in terms not of debate but of a common exploration. We think that our task has been proceeding in that way today. In saying "today" I am not really trying to cast aspersions on other days. Nevertheless we have proceeded today in a manner which is in accordance with our task of coming together and reaching our objective of agreement on general and complete disarmament.

That takes me to my next point, which is very germane to this study which we are making of the working draft proposed by the co-Chairmen for a preamble. What are we doing here? What are we here for? We are here in terms of General Assembly resolution 1722 (XVI), and the recommendation of the General Assembly is that this Conference should, as a matter of the utmost urgency, undertake negotiations with a view to reaching, on the basis of the eight principles, agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. In my view, that is relevant for the following reason. While it is true that we may be going through various phases in getting to agreement -- and we would not at this stage say whether there should or should not be a blueprint and then a treaty -- the point is that when we are drafting a preamble we are presumably drafting a preamble in terms of the fact that we are to reach agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It seems to me that at this stage, though we are not trying to reach finality on a preamble -- because we all agree, I believe, that this is a first reading and that we will come back to this matter again -- we are in fact drafting a preamble to a final agreement, because that is what we are here to do, to reach agreement. In my submission, this means that the draft preamble should not be a preamble to

an outline because an outline is probably too sketchy to need a preamble at all. In my view, we are drafting a preamble to the final document but are not doing so in a final form at this stage; we are doing so in a first-reading form.

Therefore I would suggest that we should be trying to draft a preamble either to the treaty on general and complete disarmament or, if other delegations prefer it in another form, to the basic treaty on general and complete disarmament. We would have no objection to the word "basic", as it has been explained by our colleague from the United States, but in that case it should not be "a" basic treaty but "the" basic treaty, a draft preamble to either the treaty or the basic treaty on general and complete disarmament.

We do not wish to comment in great detail at this stage on other points of difference. We agree with the representatives of Canada and Ethiopia that the co-Chairmen, taking into account this consideration here today, should try to reach a further measure of agreement on the draft preamble -- which should remain the measure of agreement which we will reach in the first reading. In other words, while we would be very happy if the co-Chairmen could, as a result of our further consideration, reach complete agreement on the draft preamble, we do not think that at this stage we should go on remitting this subject to them time and time again with a view to getting complete agreement on a draft preamble. We should, as I have said, try to get a further measure of agreement, and leave it at that for this stage, namely, the first-reading stage of our work.

I do, however, wish to say a few words about some of the contents of this document. As to the style -- namely, whether it should be "We, the Nations", or "We, the States" or "We, the Peoples of the United Nations" -- I think there is much substance in what the representative of Ethiopia said. It has been said here that the United Nations Charter mentions "the nations". That is not quite the case. The preamble of the Charter of the United Nations says, "We the peoples of the United Nations" not, "We, the Nations". Naturally, the substance of the Charter deals mainly with States, rather than with nations. Since the objective of our work here is to achieve a certain form of relations between States, I think it would be more direct and more practical for this preamble to be the product of "The States of the World." We do not think that this is a major issue. But I must say that I was not entirely convinced by the arguments of the representative of Canada because, as I say, the Charter of the United Nations begins with "We, the peoples" and not "We, the Nations". Therefore, I think that

(Mr. Lall, India)

unless there is some real argument of substance which would lead one to prefer "the nations" rather than "the States", the balance of practical advantage would lie in using the style "the States of the world".

There are separate paragraphs 7 and 8, and there is the joint paragraph 7 and 8 on the top of the second page of document ENDC/L.7. I, myself, take it that in the light of the Joint Principles it is not the intention of the joint text of paragraph 7 and 8 at the top of the second page to omit reference to the United Nations Charter. I should have thought that this was an omission which had taken place but which could be rectified, if I may use that word. I would imagine that the delegation of the United States would be quite agreeable to revert to the idea expressed in the Joint Principles. If that is so, and I am assuming that it is; I have not seen a negative look on the faces of the delegation of the United States, though I admit that one cannot work in these matters merely by studying the faces of one's colleagues, despite the fact that sometimes such studies are helpful -- I think on the whole my assumption is right, because I now see bright smiles on the faces of the United States delegation -- I submit that the difference in approach is very small, much smaller than first appeared to be the case.

I, myself, will not suggest wording to marry these two approaches, but I think it can very well be done. We in our own draft preamble made it clear that we thought, as was indeed suggested by the representative of Ethiopia, that these two processes of our task must be simultaneous, namely, progress on general and complete disarmament and the arrangements for peaceful settlement in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. We think that the differences here are not as great as they appear, and that they can be bridged. I am sure that the co-Chairmen will have the ingenuity to bridge the differences.

In passing, we are glad to recognize in paragraph 11 of this draft the substance of at least one of our suggestions. We find that there are no brackets round it, either double or single, so the two co-Chairmen have reached agreement with us about paragraph 11. We are glad to note that.

I will say that we thought certain other of our paragraphs should be included, but I gather that there is a disposition to look at some of our suggestions in terms of the more substantive aspects of our work, of further aspects of the elaboration of our document. We are for the present content to leave it at that.

(Mr. Lall, India)

This brings me to a brief comment on paragraph 14. I agree very much with what the representative of Canada said regarding paragraph 14. In addition to that I would say that if we could agree on a goal, then it should not be tucked away as paragraph 14 or 12 or 11 in sixteen or seventeen paragraphs; our goal should come at the beginning or at the end. But I do agree with the representative of Canada that there is an element of overlapping here with other paragraphs. Therefore, it does not seem very necessary to include this paragraph.

I also agree incidentally with what he said about the middle phrase here, about adjustment to change taking place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. In short, I think that this has reference to change not within a country but between States; the former is a matter which is not within the purview of the Charter of the United Nations. Therefore, I do not think it is necessary to have any great apprehension regarding that clause. However, this whole paragraph on a goal is largely covered by other parts of the preamble, and in any case I do not think this is quite the way to deal with the question of our goal.

In conclusion, we feel that the co-Chairmen might look again at this document, might try to reach another measure of agreement, and might inform us of that agreement in a second working paper. We may or may not -- I hope we will not -- wish to debate it again when we have a second working paper before us. I hope we will take the second working paper as being the stage of agreement which we have reached after our first reading and that we can then proceed to part I of the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament.

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I should like to follow up some of the comments that have been made this morning and to add a few other suggestions in the light of what has been said.

First, I agree very much with the opening words of the representative of India. The atmosphere and the accord here today are altogether more helpful; I am sure we all find this encouraging, and I hope it may continue.

The representative of India went on to refer to the opening words of the document, whether it was a draft preamble to an outline of provisions or to a treaty. I thought he summed up the position admirably; it seems to me to be exactly the position we have reached -- that in fact we are drafting the preamble to a treaty; not to the Soviet treaty, not to the United States treaty, but to a

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

treaty which we, the seventeen nations here, are going to determine. It is therefore right that we should prepare it for final agreement but, as he said, not in a final form. I entirely agree with that; it seems to me to be exactly the right approach and I hope that we can move forward in that way. And the fact that it appears as a draft and that there will be ample opportunity later to discuss it should, I think, safeguard everybody's position in this respect.

I am not particularly worried about whether we call ourselves nations or States. I would only hope that in the interests of continuity whatever we decide to do with regard to this first part will be continued throughout the preamble, because the words "nation", "State" and "country" appear in different paragraphs and I think whichever word we choose should be used throughout. I am perfectly happy to be described as a nation or a State in the corporate sense, so I do not mind how this is decided, although of course the important point brought forward by Mr. Burns may have its effect on our Soviet colleagues -- I mean his reference to the fact that we are acting under the United Nations and not under the United States. However, we can leave that to Mr. Zorin; I am sure he is quite capable of dealing with it when he speaks again.

Coming now to the first point of any substance which has emerged -- although there were one or two small drafting points -- I was a little surprised by this query in paragraph 5. I gather that our Soviet colleagues want us to include the word "cannot" here -- "war cannot and must not serve as a method of settling international disputes". Well, it is certainly the firm intention of all of us that it must not, but I am not quite so sure that we can specifically say it cannot. Certainly we have all said on various occasions that modern war would be self-defeating, and the representative of Romania has this morning brought up some quotations which I thought were valuable in that context. This is merely a suggestion, but perhaps the phrase "Convinced that war must not be permitted to serve" would combine the two thoughts. I thought of this while listening to the discussion this morning and I merely throw it out as a suggestion. I do not think this is a point of great substance, but if it is argued that war cannot serve as a method for settling disputes, as stated here -- that is, if one keeps the word "cannot" -- then I think it is a little odd to object to the words "in a peaceful world" which appear in other places and about which comment has been made. If war cannot serve as a method, I can see no objection to including the words "in a peaceful world". As I understood our Soviet colleague, he seemed to

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

fear that the inclusion of the words "in a peaceful world" had more substance than some of us had thought; he seemed to fear that this might be used in a restrictive way. I do not think that was the intention of our United States colleague, and certainly it would not be my intention in including it. I think that "in a peaceful world" is a perfectly reasonable thing to put in, and I would say that if one argues sincerely for the use of "cannot" in paragraph 5 then it is illogical to object to the reference to a peaceful world in other parts of the paper.

I should now like to turn to paragraphs 7 and 8, on which there has been a very considerable amount of discussion. A substantial point of difference has obviously emerged here. I was interested by the suggestion that came, I think, from our Indian colleague that we should include at the end of combined paragraphs 7 and 8 "in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter". I agree that this would help to safeguard many of the thoughts that people have put forward this morning as regards separating the two paragraphs, and I would certainly welcome that addition myself. I feel strongly that there is benefit in keeping paragraphs 7 and 8 combined. At a previous meeting I made certain comments on this matter which revealed my personal feeling that this is an important and substantive point, and I do not want to repeat here what I have said earlier. But I think the fact that these two matters are brought together in the Agreed Principles should not be ignored. I feel this increases the need to keep these two matters combined, as I believe the basic principle underlying them makes it essential that we keep in our minds always that these two matters are related, and indeed must be related, if we are to gain that measure of confidence which is vitally necessary if our work is to proceed.

I was interested in the suggestion to eliminate one phrase in paragraph 10 which I think our United States colleagues put forward; I thought that was helpful. We do sometimes get a bit too verbose and I would most certainly support their proposal to clarify this paragraph by eliminating that phrase and inserting the word "ensuring" in its place.

I do not think I have anything to add to what has already been said about paragraphs 11, 12 and 13.

So I come to paragraph 14, on which there has been a good deal of discussion. I was particularly interested in what our friend from Ethiopia had to say in this connexion this morning. I agree very much with much of what he said, but I wonder if he has taken fully into account the effectiveness of the word "goal" in

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

this paragraph. In that context the word "goal" seems to me to provide the answer to some of his queries and thoughts, but I certainly would not oppose his suggested elimination of the reference to justice. I would think, however, that if we put the word "international" in front of the word "justice" this might help to meet his point to some extent. In the same way one could bring in the word "international" two lines lower in front of the word "change", again to help safeguard the position. Generally speaking, I think this paragraph is a helpful one and, with certain amendments to take account of what has been suggested here this morning, it could indeed be useful.

As regards paragraphs 15 and 16, the point is again the reference to a peaceful world, to which I have already drawn attention. My own feeling is that there is definite advantage in keeping this in, and, for the reasons I have put forward, I do not think this need inspire doubts in people's minds.

In regard to the question of our future procedure, I hope very much that the discussion we have had here this morning will help our co-Chairmen materially in their further consideration of this draft preamble. I think they have done well in bringing to us so many substantially agreed paragraphs and I think we should congratulate them on it. However, I hope they will continue their work and bring it to a full and satisfactory conclusion if they possibly can. I would certainly not be averse to having one or two other representatives to help them as a drafting sub-committee. I have suggested this on previous occasions in relation to other matters and I believe there are representatives present who could help them. However, I do not press this if it is not the wish of the Committee. I merely suggest it since it might facilitate the work of the co-Chairmen. But if they are so confident in their ability to settle things between themselves I certainly would not stand in their way. We must see if they are successful; if they are not, perhaps they might consider this suggestion.

If we do not finally get agreement on one or two of these substantive points I would agree -- but at that stage, and not until we have had further attempts -- that Mr. Zorin was probably right this morning when he said that we could adopt the text of a draft with two alternatives set side by side. I think we could do that as a final stage, but personally I hope we can make further efforts in the way I have indicated before we reach that stage. But certainly, rather than to embitter our discussions and get into an unnecessary wrangle, that might well be

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

the final solution if we cannot get agreement. My own hope, in the light of our discussion this morning and the way in which we are proceeding, is that we can get agreement. I believe that is the wish of almost all of us sitting round this table.

Mr. LALL (India): In an effort to be helpful to the co-Chairmen, I should like to make a further suggestion. It concerns the phrase "in a peaceful world". I would suggest that instead of "in" the word "for" be used -- "for a peaceful world". I think this sufficiently changes the sense to meet the point raised by the Soviet representative, but does not take away the substance of the point of the United States delegation. I merely suggest this small change as a possible way of meeting one of the points of difference in the preamble.

Mr. CAVALIETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I will add only a few words to this discussion in order to stress, as other delegations have done, the interest attaching to the statements we have heard this morning -- particularly those made by the two co-Chairmen -- and to express our satisfaction at having a partly-agreed text before us.

It also seemed to me, on reading this text, that the two co-Chairmen had been good enough to take account of certain comments and proposals made by the Italian delegation. For this I would like to thank them particularly.

The text was submitted to us this morning, and we have not yet had much time to study it in detail. If I have understood the discussion correctly, what we are having today is a first reading. Consequently, we shall, I hope, have an opportunity of stating our views on this document later.

At first sight it seems that the points on which we differ are not very great, but they are nevertheless of some importance in that we are drafting a basic document which, as was said just now, I think by the representative of India, must show us our objective. If we were not sufficiently sure of the objective we have set ourselves, our future work might suffer delays and run into difficulties.

For my part, I found some difficulty in understanding the opposition of certain delegations to paragraph 14, which, in my opinion, states principles on which everyone should be in agreement. I realize that it may be possible to improve the text, and Mr. Godber, the United Kingdom representative, has just made some proposals for amendments which can certainly be very seriously considered.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

I myself would like to emphasise especially that I should be rather concerned at leaving a text not fully approved by everyone, at the moment when we are going to take up work which is also very important, and is directly connected with the objective stated in the preamble. Consequently, I think we should ask the two co-Chairmen to make a fresh effort of goodwill, to see whether they cannot later offer us a text in which the points of agreement are even more numerous than in the text submitted to us this morning. I therefore support the proposal which was made, I believe, by several delegations, and lastly by the representative of India, to the effect that the two co-Chairmen be asked to make another effort to arrive at a new text.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I found all the statements made this morning most helpful. As one of the co-Chairmen, I would welcome the aid of other representatives in a drafting sub-committee, if that is agreeable to my Soviet colleague. But I shall, of course, be very happy to try again.

I should like to refer to a maxim which I learned when I first went to school. We were told: "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again". And I do not mean to be facetious but in connexion with paragraph 5 I would tell my Soviet colleague that I was also taught that man must not commit evil but that it is not correct to say that man cannot commit evil. That is perhaps merely a stylistic difference between the English language and the Soviet language. I would also point out to my Romanian colleague that, although the President of the United States went to one of our most distinguished institutions of learning -- and perhaps our oldest -- Harvard, I hope that he would not impose upon me, as a mandate, that I must under all circumstances use Harvard English.

As to not including the words "in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter" in paragraphs 7 and 8, which the Indian representative raised, and perhaps some other speakers, we would be very happy to take that under advisement. I think perhaps the United States Delegation should have a black mark placed against it because it is true that we have used the word "States" in paragraph 14.

The preamble to the United Nations Charter uses the words: "We, the peoples of the United Nations". I suggest that here we might say "We, the peoples of the United Nations" and then add "and of the other States Parties to this treaty". The Charter also speaks of "equal rights of nations large and small" and describes the United Nations itself as "a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of common ends". I am not pointing this out to be argumentative but merely to indicate our trend of thought in connexion with drafting.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

Let me say again that I found all the interventions this morning most helpful, and I will be very happy to confer with my Soviet colleague in an effort to bring forward another draft. Our omission of some of these words from some of these paragraphs was not, I think, a matter of substance: it was more a desire not to be repetitious. We will certainly study the suggestions that have been made here.

I might say in conclusion that I thought the United Kingdom representative made a very good point on paragraph 16. Perhaps this should not be entitled a working draft proposed by the Soviet Union and the United States but merely a draft proposed by the two co-Chairmen. Perhaps, and I say this by way of suggestion, we could call it a draft preamble to the basic treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world -- or in regard to the latter words we might study the stylistic change that the Indian representative proposed. The words "in a peaceful world" appeared in the plan which President Kennedy presented to the United Nations last September.

I only wish to say that we shall certainly take all these matters into consideration and do our best to bring forward a better draft.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I fully agree with what the United States representative has just said about the helpfulness of today's discussion, which I believe has also been profitable from the point of view of our further progress towards a solution of the problem. I think we should take all the ideas which have been expressed by many delegations in account in drafting the next version of the preamble and in our further work on the treaty as a whole. I do not propose to deal at this stage with the particular observations that have been made, because I doubt whether we are now in a position to reach any conclusions on these specific points, and it would be better to bear these remarks in mind in our further work on an improved draft.

I think, however, that we should round off in some way the work we have already done and establish the necessary conditions for further progress in this matter. It seems to me that, in general, all the delegations that have spoken here have expressed approval of the working draft which we have submitted as co-Chairmen of the Committee. I have not heard any objections of principle to this working draft. There were proposals for improving the drafting of certain

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

passages and for the more precise formulation of some of the ideas contained in the working draft submitted by the co-Chairmen, but I heard no serious objections to its substance.

I think it would be very helpful to the progress of our work, and it would also, I think, be of some assistance to the public of the world, whose eyes are on our work, if we were in some way to round off this stage of our work. It is not of course a final stage, but it is nevertheless a stage in our work. It therefore seems to me that it would be useful if the Committee today recorded the general opinion which exists in this Committee and which has been expressed by many delegations, namely, that the Committee approves of the working draft of the preamble which has been submitted by the two co-Chairmen of the Committee and which is largely agreed upon, and considers that further work should be done on it by the co-Chairmen. I think that a formula of this kind, which would mean that we could rely on the entire Committee's approval, would facilitate our future work. We would no longer be attempting to work out entirely new positions on all these matters, but would base ourselves on positions which have received the general approval of all members of the Committee and on the ideas which have been put forward just now during the discussion of this working draft.

If my United States colleague has no objection, perhaps we could submit a statement along these lines for the Committee's approval. I should like to read out such a statement, which I have just drafted on the spur of the moment, but which takes account of all that has been said here and does not conflict with the position of any delegation:

"The Committee approves of the working draft preamble which has been submitted by the two co-Chairmen of the Committee (the USSR and the United States) and is largely concerted, and considers that further work should be done on it by the co-Chairmen".

It seems to me that this statement reflects what has been said today. I think it would be desirable to take this step now, because if we leave the draft that has been submitted hanging in the air, so to speak, we may give the impression of beginning our work again from the beginning. If the Committee adopts this decision - assuming, of course, that it is acceptable to all concerned - I think we shall be standing on firmer ground and can go on to do the further work of which everyone has been speaking.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

It must be said that on some questions it is obviously not possible for us to reach agreement at the present time, although I think we shall be able to narrow the gap between us on a number of points. To my mind this is not of such vital importance at this juncture. What is important is that, generally speaking, we approve of the basic provisions set out in this proposal. This establishes a basis for further and more solid progress.

Later on, we will of course submit as soon as possible a further text, in which our positions will be brought even closer together. We shall submit such a text as soon as we can.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I am wondering whether it would not be more advisable for my Soviet colleague and me to try to bring another draft to the Conference. It may be that we shall find after study, in the light of the very useful interventions this morning, that there are really no differences of substance between us; but this is not entirely clear as yet. I am not quite certain what it would mean if the Committee approved our present draft, which states the differences. If my Soviet colleague means merely an approval of the work of the two co-Chairmen, I think that is quite acceptable -- if the Committee wished to approve our work. But I should think that it would be illogical for the Committee to approve the draft and then ask us to bring in another draft.

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I was interested in the proposal which the representative of the Soviet Union put forward, and I can assure him that he and his co-Chairman colleague certainly have our confidence in their efforts. However, the consensus around this table this morning -- certainly as I have understood it -- is that, while we have confidence in them and are grateful for what they have done in this sphere, they have a little more to do before we reach this particular stage. I should have thought it would be better if they could come back with something a little more finalized before we, as it were, endorsed the results of their labours. I think other representatives have spoken in the same sense.

However, there is another point, a procedural point, of which I think we ought to take note in regard to any proposals of this sort. I am sure that the wording which the Soviet representative put forward was valuable and helpful, but

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

if we are to agree to any form of words, it seems to me that it is difficult if we do not have a prepared text before us. Whenever we have to agree specifically at any stage to any form of words -- and I am saying this not in relation to this particular proposal but as guidance for the future -- I think it would be valuable to have written texts before us. I realize that on this occasion it has been impossible for our Soviet colleague to provide that, and this is not meant in any way as criticism of what he has done. If in general we agree to submit written texts, it might delay the reaching of a decision on a particular point until the following meeting, but for the sake of precision there is value if, in regard to any proposals of this sort, we have time just to see them in writing so that we can all be entirely happy with the wording.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I am sorry that my United States colleague, who is supported by his -- and our -- colleague from the United Kingdom, does not appear to be very strongly in favour of formally concluding and rounding off the work we have already done. I can, of course, quite understand that my colleague may have some doubts. Naturally I cannot propose something of which he does not approve, because we act jointly and have submitted a joint document, which we have discussed together, and I have, of course no intention of imposing anything on anyone. I also take into account some of the comments made just now by the United Kingdom representative, although I must point out that when, for instance, we approve our daily communique, we never have a written text before us. It is read out to us.

But the statement I have proposed is shorter than the usual communique which we approve. Therefore I think that this is scarcely a reason for refusing to accept it. I have no intention of forcing it on the Committee if anyone disagrees with me, though I have heard no convincing arguments for its rejection. If the United States representative considers that we could agree on some amendments to the text we have submitted, say, in the course of a day, I should be prepared to do so. But I very much doubt that this could be done. He spoke of the need to take into consideration the views that have been put forward today. I entirely agree with him. But that is the next stage of our work. Why should we not draw up a balance and formally conclude the work which we have already done and which has not given rise to any objection on the part of members of the Committee?

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

As I understood them from the interpretation, the United States representative and, I believe, the United Kingdom representative said I had proposed that the Committee should say it "approves" the draft. I did not propose this. I proposed a more flexible and general form of words, namely, "the Committee approves of" - not "approves" - "the working draft preamble which has been submitted by the two co-Chairmen of the Committee (the USSR and the United States) and which is largely concerted" - to use the formula proposed by the Italian representative - "and considers that further work should be done on it by the co-Chairmen". In other words, it is not our idea that we should approve it now and consider the matter closed. Certainly not. I have no such intention. But it seems to me that, now that the Committee has been at work for four weeks, it would be very useful for the world to know that we have achieved something, even if not a great deal; that we have taken a step forward.

But the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom do not want this. I do not know why, but they do not want this at the present time. Well, if they do not want it, I repeat, I will not insist. But perhaps the United States representative and the United Kingdom representative will agree to postpone this matter until tomorrow so that we can try to present a joint text expressing this approval tomorrow. We can get together today, reach agreement on this joint text and submit it tomorrow in written form, as the United Kingdom representative has suggested. In that case, perhaps we could simply approve this agreed text tomorrow morning.

It seems to me that this is a matter of fundamental importance to our further work. It would show that we are not just talking and putting forward ideas, but that we are taking some action, that we are drawing up a specific document. And I must point out again that my formula does not pre-judge anyone's position. It merely states what has in fact been done and indicates that we must proceed further, taking into account what has already been achieved. That is all. It seemed to me that this is very important and vital not only as far as we ourselves are concerned, but for public opinion throughout the world. Perhaps we can agree on this. In that case we shall try and submit an agreed formula for such a decision jointly with our co-Chairman. If there are no objections, perhaps we can leave it at that.

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the decision which it took last week concerning the submission of a report by the Sub-Committee on a Treaty for the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests. Members will recall that the Committee's decision was that a report should be submitted early this week (ENDC/PV.15). Tomorrow will be Wednesday, and once Wednesday passes we are no longer in the early part of the week. While I do not wish in any way to prevent the meeting of the co-Chairmen, if they wish to meet, I submit that the Committee should, in accordance with its decision, receive the Sub-Committee's report early this week. I would prefer that we receive the report tomorrow, because we do have to examine it. We hope, of course, that it will contain some positive results. As I have said, I do not want to prevent the co-Chairmen from meeting and agreeing on any of the issues.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): In reply to the representative of Ethiopia, I wish to state that we had proposed that the co-Chairmen report at tomorrow's meeting on the discussions that have taken place in the Sub-Committee on a treaty for the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests. We understood, however, that some other delegations preferred that we postpone that report. The co-Chairmen were quite prepared to submit the report at tomorrow's meeting. That is what we originally intended doing, subject to the approval of the Committee.

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): Perhaps we could receive the report at tomorrow's meeting, in compliance with the decision taken by the Committee last week, and could discuss it at our meeting on Thursday. I would be quite satisfied with that procedure. What I was afraid of was that if we resumed the discussion on the preamble, which seemed to be what the representative of the Soviet Union was suggesting, then the subject which has been exercising our minds the most might be deferred from Thursday to Friday, in which case we might find ourselves in a rather hopeless situation.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): As co-Chairman, I am very happy to work with the representative of the Soviet Union at any time, today or any other day. However, I do think that we ought to try to reach closer agreement on the actual draft of the preamble. I do not quite see either the need or the usefulness

(Mr. Dean, United States)

of setting a time-limit, to be stated in the communique. I am quite prepared to spend as much time as necessary to try to improve the draft preamble, but I would prefer that we do not set a time-limit.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): In view of what the United States representative has just said, there is clearly some misunderstanding. I certainly do not propose that any time limit should be set for reaching agreement on the preamble - certainly not. I simply proposed that we should try and submit by tomorrow an agreed draft of our Committee's decision. That was my proposal. Where the preamble itself is concerned, I naturally think that it may well take us some considerable time to eliminate all the existing differences and disagreements on individual paragraphs. But I consider it much more important at this point to wind up in some way the stage of our work which has already been completed. I do not propose setting any time limit for preparing a final text of our preamble and I have merely made the personal suggestion that I should meet with my co-Chairman and try to reach agreement on a joint text of a brief decision which the Committee could adopt unanimously.

The Ethiopian representative's fear that we shall be discussing the question of the preamble again on Wednesday is therefore groundless. I do not propose to discuss the question of the preamble on Wednesday. But if his proposal is that the report of the three-Power Sub-Committee should be submitted tomorrow and that the question of texts should be discussed on Thursday, this is, I think, what a number of delegations have proposed and we, as co-Chairmen, have raised no objection. You will get the report tomorrow, or rather, the verbatim records of the meetings that have taken place. But we shall discuss these documents on Thursday, so that it seems to me there is no disagreement here.

I simply wished to make our position clear in view of the comment made by the United States representative, and I would re-emphasize that we do not propose setting any time-limit for preparing the final draft of the preamble. I should like to hear the reaction of my colleague, the co-Chairman, and to know whether he agrees that we should submit tomorrow an agreed text of a possible brief decision on the results of the discussion of this preamble.

That is all I have in mind. But if he thinks this impossible, then the matter will be left hanging in mid-air. I think we could try to submit a joint draft tomorrow consisting of a single sentence which would be an agreed text.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

As it would be an agreed text, there are hardly likely to be any objections from any members of the Committee, and we shall dispose of the matter in a few minutes.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I do not wish to prolong this discussion. As I said earlier, I am quite prepared to meet my Soviet colleague at any time on the actual drafting of the preamble; I am prepared to work on that at any time and try to get agreement on it. But I must confess that I do not see the utility of saying that we are in agreement on something before we are quite in agreement on it. I do not wish to delay trying to get agreement on the preamble, but it does give me concern to say that we are in agreement on something before we have actually reported back and get further decisions by members of the Conference.

I should also like to say that it has been agreed between the co-Chairmen that the United States and the United Kingdom, at least, will make statements tomorrow on the subject of a nuclear test ban.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): Allow me to summarize the situation as regards procedure. A certain number of delegates have suggested that the working draft presented today by the two co-Chairmen should be considered as approved on first reading, so to speak, and that the two co-Chairmen should continue their efforts to reach agreement on all the points on which there are differences of opinion, so that we may reach complete agreement on the text at a second reading.

The United States representative has just intimated that he sees no objection to approving the document as it stands. Could we not agree that this document has been discussed, examined by the Committee and, so to speak, approved on first reading? The two co-Chairmen would then come to a later meeting, when they have reached complete, or more or less complete, agreement on this matter.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I am afraid there must have been some misunderstanding, because I said that I could not accept the proposal of my colleague of the Soviet Union on that point.

Mr. CAVALIETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I think that something has not been properly understood by the Chairman, for I believe we said we had had a first reading of the document, not that we had approved it on first reading. Unfortunately half of the points have not yet been agreed on. We are all very optimistic. We all believe we shall manage to agree on all the texts, but we are not yet in that position, unfortunately.

Mr. de MELLO-FRANCO (Brazil) (translation from French): I only wish to say that I think that there has been a change in the proposal made by the Soviet Union delegate. If I am not mistaken, the first time he referred to the subject he said that the Conference should approve a sort of initial text. But when he spoke the second time, he said that a balance of the Committee's work should be drawn up, that is to say that what the Committee has done so far in its discussion on the draft should be put into proper form. I merely wanted to draw the Committee's attention to that difference.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I should like to give a brief explanation in connexion with what the Brazilian representative has just said. I can see no difference between what I said earlier and what I am saying now. I proposed in my statement at the outset that we should express approval of the initial text. That is what I am proposing now. I see no difference here. I propose that we express approval of the original of the preamble submitted by the co-Chairmen as a working document on which the co-Chairmen should do further work. This is what I meant when I said we should draw up a balance of our work. This is my explanation.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): We have reached a point at which it cannot be said that the suggestions made here about approving the document on first reading could be adopted as decisions of the Committee. That being so, there remains the proposal of the Soviet Union that a draft decision be prepared, which the two co-Chairmen could certainly submit to us, if not tomorrow, in the very near future.

The Conference decided to issue the following communique:

"The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its seventeenth meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. M. Tarabanov, representative and First Deputy-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria.

"Statements were made by the representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, Canada, Romania, Ethiopia, India, the United Kingdom, Italy and Brazil.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Wednesday, 11 April 1962, at 10 a.m."

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

